

Comment on paper “Extremely Low Frequency Plasmons in Metallic Mesostructures” [J.B. Pendry, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 4773 (1996)]

Andrey K. Sarychev and Vladimir M. Shalaev
Department of Physics, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM, 88003

In a seminal paper [1] Pendry, et al. show that in metallic mesostructures the effective dielectric permittivity ε_e can be negative, even in the GHz range, which makes possible the excitation of extremely low-frequency plasmons. The building blocks of the new material are thin metallic wires with radius r in μm scale, which are arranged in a cubic lattice, with lattice constant a in mm scale. The authors suggest that the effective electron mass can increase by $\sim 10^4$ times. This dramatic change in the mass, along with a decrease of the effective electron density (because of the small fraction of the space occupied by the wires) result in a depression of the plasma frequency ω_p by 6 orders of magnitude. Recently, the negative ε_e in the GHz range was experimentally verified [2]. In calculations of ε_e , Pendry et al. used the Drude formula, where the original plasma frequency was replaced by its low frequency counterpart. In the course of calculations, it was implied that the EM vector potential is constant inside the wires. If the vector potential inside the wires was $\mathbf{R}$ -dependent, the effective electron mass would also be $\mathbf{R}$ -dependent and thus, we believe, meaningless.

In our recent papers [3] we developed a first-principle theory for ε_e in mesostructures. Our approach is based on the direct solution of the Maxwell equations and it does not involve mass renormalization. For the orthorhombic wire lattice with lattice constants a_x, a_y, a_z and wire radius $r \ll a_x, a_y, a_z$ we obtain the dielectric tensor in the following form

$$\varepsilon_{e,xx} = \varepsilon_d - \frac{\pi r^2}{S_{yz}} \frac{\varepsilon_d - [1 + \pi (S_{yz}/\lambda^2) \varepsilon_d] \tilde{\varepsilon}_m}{1 - (\pi r/\lambda)^2 (\mathcal{L}_{yz} + 1) \tilde{\varepsilon}_m} \quad (1)$$

where λ is the wavelength, ε_d is the dielectric constant of the host material, $S_{yz} = a_y a_z$, $\tilde{\varepsilon}_m = \varepsilon_m F(2\pi r \sqrt{\varepsilon_m}/\lambda)$ is the renormalized metal permittivity, with $F(x) = 2J_1(x)/[xJ_0(x)]$ expressed in terms of the Bessel functions J_0 and J_1 , and

$$\mathcal{L}_{yz} = 2 \log \left(\frac{a_y \sqrt{1 + e^2}}{2r} \right) + \frac{e\pi}{2} - \left(e - \frac{1}{e} \right) \arctan e - 3, \quad (2)$$

where $e = a_y/a_z$. Components $\varepsilon_{e,yy}$ and $\varepsilon_{e,zz}$ of the dielectric tensor can be obtained from Eqs. (1) and (2) by corresponding interchange of indices x, y, z . For a cubic lattice, $a_x = a_y = a_z = a$, and Eq. (1) reduces to

$$\varepsilon_e = \varepsilon_d - \frac{\pi r^2}{a^2} \frac{\varepsilon_d - [1 + \pi (a/\lambda)^2 \varepsilon_d] \tilde{\varepsilon}_m}{1 - (\pi r/\lambda)^2 (\mathcal{L} + 1) \tilde{\varepsilon}_m}, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathcal{L} = 2 \ln(a/\sqrt{2}r) + \pi/2 - 3$.

In Fig. 1 we show the “loss”-factor $\kappa = |\varepsilon_e''/\varepsilon_e'|$ for ε_e obtained from Eq. (3) and from the Drude-like Eq. (15) of [1] for Al wire cubic crystal. In Fig. 1a, the crystal parameters are the same as in [1]: $r = 1\mu\text{m}$ and $a = 5\text{mm}$. The difference between the two approaches, although not dramatic, is still significant. One might think that for thicker wires, with r much larger than the penetration (skin) depth $\delta = c/(\omega \text{Im}\sqrt{\varepsilon_m})$ Pendry’s formula works better because the effective electron mass is nearly $\mathbf{R}$ -independent [for Al, $\delta \simeq (2.5/\sqrt{\nu})\mu\text{m}$, with ν given in GHz]. However, for $r = 10\mu\text{m}$, the difference between the formulae becomes even larger (Fig. 1b). This is because Eq. (15) of [1] does not properly take into account the skin effect (which increases with r). In particular, for $\delta/r \ll 1$, Eq. (15) predicts that $\kappa = (\delta/r)^2 / |\ln(a/r)(1 - \omega^2/\omega_p^2)|$, whereas for strong skin effect the dependence must be $\propto \delta/r$ [4]; this is the case for Eq. (3) giving $\kappa \approx (\delta/r)/|\mathcal{L}(1 - \omega^2/\omega_p^2)|$ (for $|\omega - \omega_p| \ll \omega_p$). We also note that Eq. (3) gives for the “plasma” frequency $\omega_p^2 = 4c^2\pi/(a^2\mathcal{L}\varepsilon_d)$, which differs from the ω_p from Eq. (14) of [1] by a factor of $2 \ln(a/r)/(\mathcal{L}\varepsilon_d)$ [ω_p is defined through $\varepsilon_e'(\omega_p) = 0$ for $\varepsilon_e'' \rightarrow 0$]. The difference in ε_e given by Pendry’s formula and Eq. 3 decreases with increasing δ/r . However, for r significantly smaller than δ (small skin effect), ε_e is almost purely imaginary, so that the low- ω plasmons cannot be excited because of large losses; also, the vector potential inside the wires, in this case, has a non-negligible dependence on $\mathbf{R}$ so that the effective mass of the electron has questionable meaning. In general, for potential applications of metal mesostructures it is crucial to have small losses, which is possible only when the skin effect is large; in this case, we believe, formula (1) should be used.

-
- [1] J.B. Pendry, A.J. Holben, W.J. Stewart, and I. Youngs, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 4773 (1996).
 - [2] D.R. Smith, W.J. Padilla, D.C. Vier, S.C. NematNasser, S. Schultz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 4184 (2000).
 - [3] A.K. Sarychev, R.C. McPhedran, and V.M. Shalaev, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 8531 (2000); A.K. Sarychev and V.M. Shalaev, Phys. Reports **335**, 275 (2000).
 - [4] L.D. Landau, E.M. Lifshitz, and L.P. Pitaevskii, *Electrodynamics of Continuous Media*, Pergamon, 1984.

FIG. 1. Loss-factor κ found from Eq. (3) (solid lines) and Eq. (15) of Ref. 1 (dashed lines); $a = 5\text{mm}$, $\varepsilon_d = 1$.

